

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheets of drawings include Figs. 1-10. These sheets replace the original sheets including Figs. 1-10. Identifying text has been added. No new matter has been added.

Attachment: Five (5) Replacement Sheets

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner (i) objected to the specification as lacking a reference to the claimed priority documents; (ii) objected to the drawings; (iii) objected to the claims due to informalities (iv) rejected claims 1-44 under 35 U.S.C. 112 as indefinite. In the interest of efficiently furthering prosecution, Applicants hereby amend claims 1-6, 11, 13, 15, 18-19, 21-33, 36-38, 40-41, and 43-44. No new matter has been added.

In response to the Examiner's note on priority, Applicants hereby amend the specification to include a reference to the priority applications. Certified copies of the priority application were provided to the USPTO along with the oath at the time of filing.

In response to the Examiner's objections to the drawings, Applicants hereby submit five pages of replacement sheets, replacing the drawings as required by the Examiner.

Claim Objections

In response to the objection to claims 2-15 and 18-44, Applicants have amended the claims to delete number references, amended claim 4, 6, 11, 24, 25, 28-29, 31, 32, 36, and 41 as suggested by the Examiner to correct the antecedent basis issues. Additionally, applicants have deleted recitations in claims 36, 40, and 43, as well as amending claim 44 to be an independent claim to more clearly recite the claimed aspects of the innovations in the present application.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-15 and 18-44 are now in condition for formal allowance, and the objections should be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 112

The Examiner rejected claims 1-44 under 35 U.S.C. 112 as being indefinite.

Specifically, the Examiner rejected claims 4, 5, 18, 25, 28, and 40 as failing to point out what is included or excluded by the claim language. Applicants have amended these claims to more clearly recite aspects of the present innovations. Applicants believe that the claims as amended are not omnibus claims and do point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention.

The Examiner further rejected claims 1, 21, 22, and 43 as vague and indefinite for including the recitation “etc”. Applicants have amended these claims to delete this recitation.

The Examiner further rejected the limitation “the means (90,160,192, 196, 194)” as lacking appropriate antecedent basis. Applicants have amended these claims to delete this recitation and to provide a recitation with appropriate antecedent basis.

Finally, the Examiner rejected claim 38 for including the recitation “said program code” without proper antecedent basis. Applicants have amended these claims to delete this recitation and to provide a recitation with appropriate antecedent basis.

Applicants therefore respectfully submit that claims 1-44 as amended are not indefinite, and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112 should be withdrawn.

Conclusory Remarks

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-44 as amended in conduction for allowance, and action to that end is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is encouraged to call Applicants' attorney at the number below if doing so will in any way advance prosecution of this application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required, or credit in the overpayment, to Deposit Account No. **07-1896** referencing Attorney Docket No. **348162-982790**.

Respectfully submitted,

DLA PIPER LLP (US)

Date: August 12, 2010

By: /Philip Jensen/
Philip Jensen
Reg. No. 63,563
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

Philip Jensen
DLA Piper LLP (US)
2000 University Avenue
East Palo Alto, CA 94303-2248
650-833-2119 (Direct)
650-833-2000 (Main)
650-833-2001 (Facsimile)
philip.jensen@dlapiper.com